



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/855,388	05/15/2001	John D. Reed	PF02077NA	8962

23447 7590 08/28/2003

MOTOROLA INC  
5401 NORTH BEACH STREET  
MAILSTOP E230  
FORT WORTH, TX 76137

EXAMINER

YANG, RYAN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2672

DATE MAILED: 08/28/2003

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/855,388

Applicant(s)

REED ET AL.

Examiner

Ryan R Yang

Art Unit

2672

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2,3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 9 and 15 are independent claims. This action is non-final.
2. The present title of the invention is "Method and apparatus for processing data including an image for presentation on a display".

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 6 recites the limitation " locating step comprises the step of positioning the image wholly in one of the first and second display portions " in line 2-3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 2672

5. Claims 1, 9 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sakaiharu et al. (JP PN H2-79090).

As per claim 1, Sakaiharu et al., hereinafter Sakaiharu, discloses a method for processing data including an image for presentation on a display having a first display portion and a second display portion, the first and second display portions separated by a visible seam having a location and a width, the method comprising the steps of:

locating a position on at least one of the first and second display portions for displaying the image (Figure 2 61 or 62); and

displaying the image in said position such that, when said position extends beyond one of the display portions and onto a next one of the display portions, a portion of the image corresponding to the location of the visible seam is omitted (Figure 2 between 61 and 62, a portion of the image is omitted).

6. As per claim 9, Sakaiharu discloses an apparatus for processing data including an image for presentation on a display having a first display portion and a second display portion, the first and second display portions separated by a visible seam having a location and a width, the apparatus comprising:

an input interface for accepting the data (Figure 1 between 1 and 2);

a processor coupled to the input interface for processing the data (Figure 1 1);

and

an output interface coupled to the processor for outputting the processed data (Figure 1 3), wherein the processor is programmed to:

determine a location of a position on at least one of the first and second display portions for displaying the image (Figure 2 61 and 62); and

process the data for displaying the image in said position such that, when said position extends beyond one of the display portions and onto a next one of the display portions, a portion of the image corresponding to the location of the visible seam is omitted (Figure 2 between 61 and 62, a portion of the image is omitted).

7. As per claim 15, Sakaihara discloses an electronic device for processing data including an image, comprising:

an input interface for accepting the data (Figure 1 between 1 and 2);

a processor coupled to the input interface for processing the data (Figure 1 1);

and

a display coupled to the processor for displaying the processed data, the display having a first display portion and a second display portion, the first and second display portions separated by a visible seam having a location and a width (Figure 2 61 and 62 and between 61 and 62, a portion of the image is omitted);

wherein the processor is programmed to:

determine a location of a position on at least one of the first and second display portions for displaying the image (Figure 2 61 and 62); and

process the data for displaying the image in said position such that, when said position extends beyond one of the display portions and onto a next one of the display portions, a portion of the image corresponding to the location of the visible seam is omitted (Figure 2 between 61 and 62, a portion of the image is omitted).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 2, 3, 10 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakaihara as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hecht (4,751,695).

As per claim 2, Sakaihara demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of independent claim 1, supra.

Sakaihara discloses a method for processing data to omit a portion of the image. It is noted that Sakaihara does not explicitly disclose the step of repeatedly moving the image back and forth perpendicular to the visible seam during a time period, such that the portion of the image corresponding to the position of the visible seam differs with time, thereby allowing a display of potentially omitted portions of the image during part of the time period, however, this is known in the art as taught by Hecht. Hecht discloses a method of compensating for defective pixel by shifting and counter shifting data into defective image bar such that a pair of mutually exclusive partial images are combined to form a substantially defect free image (column 4, line 28-34).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Hecht into Sakaihara because

Sakaihara disclose a method for processing data to omit a portion of the image and Hecht disclose a method to compensate defect image by shifting and counter shifting data into defective area in order to produce a substantially free image.

10. As per claim 3, Sakaihara demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of independent claim 1, supra.

Sakaihara discloses a method for processing data to omit a portion of the image. It is noted that Sakaihara does not explicitly discloses the step of moving the image back and forth perpendicular to the visible seam, in response to a user input through a user interface, however, this is known in the art as taught by Hecht. Hecht discloses a method of compensating for defective pixel by shifting and counter shifting data into defective image bar such that a pair of mutually exclusive partial images are combined to form a substantially defect free image (column 4, line 28-34).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Hecht into Sakaihara because Sakaihara disclose a method for processing data to omit a portion of the image and Hecht disclose a method to compensate defect image by shifting and counter shifting data into defective area in order to produce a substantially free image.

As for having a user interface to select the process, it is clearly a designer's choice to make the process automatic or manual control. See *In re Venner*, 262 F.2d 91, 95, 120 USPQ 193, 194 (CCPA 1958).

11. As per claim 10, Sakaihara demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of independent claim 9, supra.

Sakaihara discloses an apparatus for processing data to omit a portion of the image. It is noted that Sakaihara does not explicitly disclose the process of repeatedly moving the image back and forth perpendicular to the visible seam during a time period, such that the portion of the image corresponding to the position of the visible seam differs with time, thereby allowing a display of potentially omitted portions of the image during part of the time period, however, this is known in the art as taught by Hecht. Hecht discloses an apparatus for process of compensating for defective pixel by shifting and counter shifting data into defective image bar such that a pair of mutually exclusive partial images are combined to form a substantially defect free image (column 4, line 28-34).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Hecht into Sakaihara because Sakaihara disclose an apparatus for processing data to omit a portion of the image and Hecht disclose an apparatus for processing to compensate defect image by shifting and counter shifting data into defective area in order to produce a substantially free image.

12. As per claim 16, Sakaihara demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of independent claim 15, supra.

Sakaihara discloses a processor for processing data to omit a portion of the image. It is noted that Sakaihara does not explicitly disclose the process of repeatedly moving the image back and forth perpendicular to the visible seam during a time period, such that the portion of the image corresponding to the position of the visible seam differs with time, thereby allowing a display of potentially omitted portions of the image



during part of the time period, however, this is known in the art as taught by Hecht. Hecht discloses a process of compensating for defective pixel by shifting and counter shifting data into defective image bar such that a pair of mutually exclusive partial images are combined to form a substantially defect free image (column 4, line 28-34).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Hecht into Sakaihara because Sakaihara disclose a processor for processing data to omit a portion of the image and Hecht disclose a processor for processing to compensate defect image by shifting and counter shifting data into defective area in order to produce a substantially free image.

13. Claims 4, 11 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakaihara as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Banitt (5,963,247).

As per claim 4, Sakaihara demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of independent claim 1, supra.

Sakaihara discloses a method for processing data in a multiple display environment. It is noted that Sakaihara does not explicitly disclose the step of scaling the image for presentation on a display surface having a size and aspect ratio compatible with the first and second display portions aligned adjacent to one another and separated by more than the width of the visible seam, however, this is known in the art as taught by Banitt. Banitt discloses a multiple display system in which images are scaled and aligned (Figure 4 the blocks of Edge Matching and Scaling, lighting; Figure 3 shows image separated by a seam).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Banitt into Sakaihara because Sakaihara disclose a method for processing data in a multiple display environment and Banitt discloses a method to scale and align image in order to utilize the whole display area.

14. As per claim 11, Sakaihara demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of independent claim 9, *supra*.

Sakaihara discloses an apparatus for processing data in a multiple display environment. It is noted that Sakaihara does not explicitly disclose the step of scaling the image for presentation on a display surface having a size and aspect ratio compatible with the first and second display portions aligned adjacent to one another and separated by more than the width of the visible seam, however, this is known in the art as taught by Banitt. Banitt discloses a multiple display system in which images are scaled and aligned (Figure 4 the blocks of Edge Matching and Scaling, lighting; Figure 3 shows image separated by a seam).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Banitt into Sakaihara because Sakaihara disclose an apparatus for processing data in a multiple display environment and Banitt discloses an apparatus to scale and align image in order to utilize the whole display area.

15. As per claim 17, Sakaihara demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of independent claim 1, *supra*.

Sakaihara discloses a processor for processing data in a multiple display environment. It is noted that Sakaihara does not explicitly disclose the step of scaling the image for presentation on a display surface having a size and aspect ratio compatible with the first and second display portions aligned adjacent to one another and separated by more than the width of the visible seam, however, this is known in the art as taught by Banitt. Banitt discloses a processor multiple display system in which images are scaled and aligned (Figure 4 the blocks of Edge Matching and Scaling, lighting; Figure 3 shows image separated by a seam).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Banitt into Sakaihara because Sakaihara disclose a processor for processing data in a multiple display environment and Banitt discloses a processor to scale and align image in order to utilize the whole display area.

16. Claims 5, 12 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakaihara as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Bricklin (5,680,152).

As per claim 5, Sakaihara demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of independent claim 1, supra.

Sakaihara discloses a method for processing data in a multiple display environment. It is noted that Sakaihara does not explicitly disclose avoiding an important feature of the image to the visible seam, however, this is known in the art as taught by Meier et al., hereinafter Meier. Meier discloses an intelligent scrolling method

in which processing the image to identify predetermined important features of the image (Figure 10 530 the first level indicator); and

locating the image such that the predetermined important features do not fall within the portion of the image corresponding to the position of the visible seam ("Indicator 530 is therefore constrained to move only within first level window 500", column 12, line 37-39, where the region outside of the boundary is considered a seam).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Bricklin into Sakaihara because Sakaihara disclose a method for processing data in a multiple display environment and Bricklin disclose a method to display an important feature of an image is constrained into a region in order for it to be seen at all time.

17. As per claim 12, Sakaihara demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of independent claim 9, supra.

Sakaihara discloses an apparatus for processing data in a multiple display environment. It is noted that Sakaihara does not explicitly disclose avoiding an important feature of the image to the visible seam, however, this is known in the art as taught by Meier et al., hereinafter Meier. Meier discloses an intelligent scrolling apparatus in which process the image to identify predetermined important features of the image (Figure 10 530 the first level indicator); and

locate the image such that the predetermined important features do not fall within the portion of the image corresponding to the position of the visible seam ("Indicator 530

is therefore constrained to move only within first level window 500", column 12, line 37-39, where the region outside of the boundary is considered a seam).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Bricklin into Sakaiharu because Sakaiharu disclose an apparatus for processing data in a multiple display environment and Bricklin disclose a process to display an important feature of an image is constrained into a region in order for it to be seen at all time.

18. As per claim 18, Sakaiharu demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of independent claim 15, *supra*.

Sakaiharu discloses a processor for processing data in a multiple display environment. It is noted that Sakaiharu does not explicitly disclose avoiding an important feature of the image to the visible seam, however, this is known in the art as taught by Meier et al., hereinafter Meier. Meier discloses a processor for intelligent scrolling which processing the image to identify predetermined important features of the image (Figure 10 530 the first level indicator); and

locating the image such that the predetermined important features do not fall within the portion of the image corresponding to the position of the visible seam ("Indicator 530 is therefore constrained to move only within first level window 500", column 12, line 37-39, where the region outside of the boundary is considered a seam).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Bricklin into Sakaiharu because Sakaiharu disclose a processor for processing data in a multiple display environment

and Bricklin discloses a processor to display an important feature of an image is constrained into a region in order for it to be seen at all time.

19. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakaiharas as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Caine (5,361,078).

As per claim 6, Sakaiharas demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of independent claim 1, *supra*.

Sakaiharas discloses a method for processing data in a multiple display environment. It is noted that Sakaiharas does not explicitly disclose the step of locating step comprises the step of positioning the image wholly in one of the first and second display portions, however, this is known in the art as taught by Suga et al., hereinafter Suga. Suga discloses a method of displaying image on a multiple display system in which "each screen displays a portion of an image or the whole image when the video drivers read out data", Abstract.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Suga into Sakaiharas because Sakaiharas disclose a method for processing data in a multiple display environment and Suga disclose a method to display a portion of an image or the whole image to each screen in order to give greater flexibility in controlling what is displayed on the screen.

20. Claims 7, 13 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakaiharas as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Forcier (5,590,257).

As per claim 7, Sakaiharas demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of independent claim 1, *supra*.

Sakaihara discloses a method for processing data in a multiple display environment. It is noted that Sakaihara does not explicitly disclose the step of wrapping the text to fit into areas of the first and second display portions not used for displaying the image, however, this is known in the art as taught by Forcier. Forcier discloses a method of displaying image on a multiple display system (Figure 7L) in which text is wrapped to fit into areas of the first and second display portions not used for displaying the image (Figure 7N).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Forcier into Sakaihara because Sakaihara discloses a method for processing data in a multiple display environment and Forcier discloses text can be wrapped around in order to better present the text information in a text/image environment.

21. As per claim 13, Sakaihara demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of independent claim 9, *supra*.

Sakaihara discloses an apparatus for processing data in a multiple display environment. It is noted that Sakaihara does not explicitly disclose the step of wrapping the text to fit into areas of the first and second display portions not used for displaying the image, however, this is known in the art as taught by Forcier. Forcier discloses an apparatus of displaying image on a multiple display system (Figure 7L) in which text is wrapped to fit into areas of the first and second display portions not used for displaying the image (Figure 7N).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Forcier into Sakaihara because Sakaihara disclose an apparatus for processing data in a multiple display environment and Forcier discloses text can be wrapped around in order to better present the text information in a text/image environment.

22. As per claim 19, Sakaihara demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of independent claim 15, supra.

Sakaihara discloses a processor for processing data in a multiple display environment. It is noted that Sakaihara does not explicitly discloses the process of wrapping the text to fit into areas of the first and second display portions not used for displaying the image, however, this is known in the art as taught by Forcier. Forcier discloses an apparatus of displaying image on a multiple display system (Figure 7L) in which text is wrapped to fit into areas of the first and second display portions not used for displaying the image (Figure 7N).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Forcier into Sakaihara because Sakaihara disclose an apparatus for processing data in a multiple display environment and Forcier discloses text can be wrapped around in order to better present the text information in a text/image environment.

23. Claims 8, 14 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakaihara as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of McNelley (5,438,357).



As per claim 8, Sakaihara demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of independent claim 1, supra.

Sakaihara discloses a method for processing data in a multiple display environment. It is noted that Sakaihara does not explicitly disclose attributes for controlling at least one of scaling and placement of the image on the display and identifying important areas of the image, and wherein the locating step comprises the step of scaling and locating the image and protecting the important areas in accordance with the attributes, however, this is known in the art as taught by McNelley. McNelley discloses a method of displaying image in which the head section is ensured to remain within the image portion 52 (Figure 5 52 "Tight head shots would generally require a quick tracking response to ensure the head remains within the image portion 52; noted in Figure 2A-2G the image of a head can be scaled and moved and a head is made up of attributes).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of McNelley into Sakaihara because Sakaihara discloses a method for processing data in a multiple display environment and McNelley discloses the critical part of an image can be scaled and moved but ensured to remain within an area in order to better present the image.

24. As per claim 14, Sakaihara demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of independent claim 9, supra.

Sakaihara discloses an apparatus for processing data in a multiple display environment. It is noted that Sakaihara does not explicitly disclose attributes for

controlling at least one of scaling and placement of the image on the display and identifying important areas of the image, and wherein the locating step comprises the step of scaling and locating the image and protecting the important areas in accordance with the attributes, however, this is known in the art as taught by McNelley. McNelley discloses an apparatus of displaying image in which the head section is ensured to remain within the image portion 52 (Figure 5 52 "Tight head shots would generally require a quick tracking response to ensure the head remains within the image portion 52; noted in Figure 2A-2G the image of a head can be scaled and moved and a head is made up of attributes).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of McNelley into Sakaihara because Sakaihara discloses an apparatus for processing data in a multiple display environment and McNelley discloses the critical part of an image can be scaled and moved but ensured to remain within an area in order to better present the image.

25. As per claim 20, Sakaihara demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of independent claim 15, supra.

Sakaihara discloses a processor for processing data in a multiple display environment. It is noted that Sakaihara does not explicitly disclose attributes for controlling at least one of scaling and placement of the image on the display and identifying important areas of the image, and wherein the locating step comprises the step of scaling and locating the image and protecting the important areas in accordance with the attributes, however, this is known in the art as taught by McNelley. McNelley

Art Unit: 2672

discloses a processor for displaying image in which the head section is ensured to remain within the image portion 52 (Figure 5 52 "Tight head shots would generally require a quick tracking response to ensure the head remains within the image portion 52; noted in Figure 2A-2G the image of a head can be scaled and moved and a head is made up of attributes).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of McNelley into Sakaihara because Sakaihara discloses a processor for processing data in a multiple display environment and McNelley discloses the critical part of an image can be scaled and moved but ensured to remain within an area in order to better present the image.

### ***Conclusion***

25. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

### ***Inquiries***

26. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Ryan Yang** whose telephone number is **(703) 308-6133**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Michael Razavi**, can be reached at **(703) 305-4713**.

Art Unit: 2672

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

**(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)**

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.



Ryan Yang  
August 14, 2003